

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 11-14 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as drawn to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are amended according to the Examiner's suggestion to obviate the rejection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0072018 to Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,919,972 to Kumada et al. (hereinafter "Kumada"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Sasaki teaches many of the features as positively recited at least in independent claims 1, 5 and 11-14. However, Sasaki fails to teach "a limited output point group generation unit that generates limited output points in the output space respectively corresponding to limiting input points satisfying a predetermined restraint condition that is set in the input space in advance, to generate a plurality of limited pairs each consisting of a limited input point and a corresponding limited output point," as positively recited in the pending claims. As discussed at least on page 16, line 13 to page 17, line 18, and shown in Figs. 3A and 4B of the Applicant's disclosure, limited output points in, for example, an  $L^*a^*b^*$  color space are generated from limited input points in a CMYK color space according to a constraint condition set in the input space, which in this case is a total amount of control hyper plane within the input space. This constraint condition is set along

the entirety of the color space and encompasses variations across all variables within the color space.

In contrast, Sasaki teaches that, at least in paragraph [0040], a YMCK data point is generated from an  $L^*a^*b^*$  point. Each three-dimensional  $L^*a^*b^*$  point, from which a four-dimensional YMCK point is to be generated, is chosen from a preexisting target color space, and not independently generated, as discussed in [0028]. Therefore, Sasaki only generates YMCK data points and not  $L^*a^*b^*$  data points. In other words, Sasaki fails to teach generating a limited input point and a corresponding limited output point as a limited pair, but teaches only generating one point from an already preexisting point. Additionally, Sasaki fails to teach an input point element determination unit that determines at least one element of the input point satisfying the constraint condition on the basis of the plurality of limited pairs, as positively recited in the pending claims. As discussed at least on page 19, lines 6-17 of the Applicant's disclosure, the calculation of one element of the input point, in this case a K value, is performed by the elements L, a and b. The general functional relationship between a predicted K value and L, a and b inputs is shown by the equation on page 19, line 17. Further, the prediction of the K value, as discussed above, involves a plurality of  $L^*a^*b^*$  output points. That is, a plurality of  $L^*a^*b^*$  points are considered in their entirety in the prediction of a K value.

Sasaki, however, teaches only that a single parameter of a single point is used in predicting a single element K, such as color saturation such as color saturation ( $C^*$ ) or luminosity ( $L^*$ ). As discussed in paragraph [0062], a single luminosity from a single point or a single color saturation from a single point is used in order to predict a K value. An equation showing the general form of this equation, incorporating only a single value, is shown in paragraph [0061], defining the black colorant amount KM.

For at least the above reasons, Sasaki does not teach, nor does it suggest, the combination of features as positively recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 11-14. Kumada also fails to overcome the deficiencies as discussed above. Further, claims 2-4, 6-9 and 10 are also allowable at least for their dependence on allowable independent claims as enumerated above, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer  
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:ARK/hms

Date: November 8, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--